

Draft
MINUTES OF THE GREENSBORO HISTORIC
PRESERVATION COMMISSION
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBER
MELVIN MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING
AUGUST 30, 2006

MEMBERS PRESENT: CHAIR STOUT, COLEMAN, FREYALDENHOVEN, HATFIELD, HENSLEY, WHARTON. (KELLY arrived at 5:40 pm.)

STAFF PRESENT: STEFAN-LEIH GEARY and MIKE COWHIG, Housing and Community Development (HCD); MIKE WILLIAMS, ESQ., City Attorney's Office.

CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Stout called the meeting to order at 4:10 p.m. and welcomed everyone.

ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA:

Mr. Cowhig said for Item B, 210 Isabel Street, the applicant was not able to attend the meeting today and has asked if that could be continued until the next meeting.

INTRODUCTION OF COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Chair Stout introduced members of the Commission and gave a brief overview of how items were to be presented and the methods used for any appeals from Commission decisions.

All persons wishing to speak at today's meeting and staff were duly sworn or affirmed. Chair Stout said should anyone else decide to speak later, they could be sworn or affirmed at that time.

Chair Stout confirmed that all Commissioners had received their information packets; no Commissioners had a conflict of interest with regard to any items on the agenda; no Commissioners had discussed any applications prior to the meeting.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

The absences of Commissioners Ayscue and Kelly were approved.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES JULY 26, 2006 MEETING:

Mr. Wharton made the following corrections: page 2, under New Information for Reconsideration, the last sentence in the first paragraph, the last word "porch" should read "balcony;" page 18, the second to the last paragraph where it says: "Mr. Wharton commented that it would be possible to add a window" should be: "Mr. Wharton observed that there were other first front elevations in the neighborhood that has no opening door or window in the historic districts."

Ms. Hensley moved adoption of the minutes of the July 26, 2006 meeting as amended, seconded by Ms. Coleman. The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Stout, Coleman, Freyaldenhoven, Hensley, Wharton. Nays: None.)

Commissioner Hatfield arrived at 4:16 p.m. and participated in the balance of the meeting.

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS (PUBLIC HEARING):

- a) **Application No. 780**
Location: 105 West Hendrix Street
Applicant: Ernie Manuel
Property Owner: Ernie Manuel
Date Application Received: 5-22-06 (GRANTED)

Description of work

Request for recommendation for Special Exception to reduce the number of required off street parking spaces pursuant to Section 30-4-4.2 (B) 2 of the City's Development Ordinance:

"All street setback (except as provided in subsection 1] above), interior setback, building coverage, and height requirements shall comply with applicable zoning regulations unless a special exception is approved by the Board of Adjustment. The special exception shall be granted only if it complies with the intent of the architectural and historic guidelines of the historic district and if first recommended by the Historic Preservation Commission."

Mr. Cowhig said that ordinance also refers to parking requirements. He did not see it in there and he was not sure why that is omitted, but it does refer to parking requirements as well.

Staff comment and recommendation:

Based on information contained in the application and review by the Design Review Committee, the staff recommends in favor of recommending this Special Exception. In the staff's opinion the of the *Historic District Design Guidelines- Walkways, Driveways and Parking Areas* (pages 28-30), for the following reasons:

Fact: The house at 105 West Hendrix is an outstanding example of a Craftsman Bungalow and a contributing structure in the Fisher Park National Register Historic District.

Fact: The property is zoned GOM which allows office use. The house is currently used for the offices of a small business. Under the GOM zoning, off-street parking must be provided. Because the lot is so small the only place for off-street parking is in front of the house.

Fact: There is ample on street parking on West Hendrix Street and the parking needs of the existing business are minimal.

Guideline 6 (page 30):

Parking areas for residential properties should be well screened and at the rear of the property. Parking areas in front yards are not appropriate. New parking areas should be designed to have a minimal effect on the neighborhood environment.

In support

Ernie Manuel, 404 Woodland Drive, previously sworn or affirmed.

Mr. Cowhig added that on Mr. Manuel's application, he indicated that he would like to be exempted from the requirement to install a backflow preventer, which is the case you see in front of a lot of office

properties that is usually metal and it prevents water from backing into the water supply. That is beyond the purview of this Commission. However, if it is not needed, the Commission could certainly make a suggestion that we could pass on to the Building Inspections Office.

A discussion among Commissioners and Mr. Manuel ensued with suggestions as to how he could hide the backflow preventer, if it were necessary.

Mr. Cowhig said the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association recommended in favor. The representative of the Association was not able to attend and sent that through an e-mail.

In opposition

None.

Summary

Chair Stout said this is Application No. 780 for work at 105 West Hendrix Street. The applicant is Melvin Manuel. His request was for a Special Exception to parking and he also had a request for a Special Exception to a backflow assembly, over which the Commission seems to have no purview. Staff comments recommend in favor of approving the Special Exception for parking. They have indicated this is through Guidelines, Driveways and Parking, pages 28 and 30 and Guideline No. 6. They noted that the house is used for low impact business. Parking needs are minimal. They also noted that when they were there making photos of the house, that there was lots of parking available.

Speaking in support of the application was Ernie Manuel, the owner of the property, who resides at 404 Woodland Drive. He iterated that it is small office that is used by people that travel and is used as a home base and rarely has lots of visitors or parking issues. He also discussed the backflow assembly and mentioned that he did not want to do anything that would interfere with the aesthetics of the house. The Commission members discussed the lack of purview over that issue related to the backflow assembly. They may make some type of suggestion, but they do not have any authority. There was no one else to speak in favor of this application, with the exception that Mr. Cowhig had mentioned the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association representative was not able to attend and that the Neighborhood did recommend in favor of this application. They had voted on it at their meeting. There was no one to speak in opposition to the application.

Discussion

None.

Motion

Mr. Wharton moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission recommend the Special Exception to the Board of Adjustment, seconded by Ms. Freyaldenhoven. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Stout, Coleman, Freyaldenhoven, Hatfield, Hensley, Wharton. Nays: None.)

b) Application No. 803
Location: 210 Isabel Street
Applicant: Catherine R. Durham
Owner: Jeff and Catherine Durham
Date Received: 8/30/06 (CONTINUED)

This item was continued at the beginning of the meeting at the request of the applicant.

c) **Application No. 801**
Location: 204 West Bessemer Avenue
Applicant: David Brossoit
Owner: David Brossoit
Date Received: 8-9-06 (GRANTED)

Description of Work

Construction of Carport.

Staff comment and recommendation.

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting a Certificate of Appropriateness for this project. In the staff's opinion, the application is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines, Garages and Accessory Structures (page 35)*, for the following reasons:

Fact: The form of the proposed carport is a simple rectangular mass with a hip roof that is a typical form for garages in the historic district.

Fact: The size of the proposed carport is relatively small with respect to the house and similar to garages in the historic district.

Fact: The proposed structure is sited at the rear of the house and in a location that is traditional for the historic district.

Fact: Materials for the carport will match the house or be chosen from the approved new construction materials list. These include wood lap siding and fiber cement lap siding. Both are considered compatible with the character of the historic district.

Guidelines (page 36):

Design new garages and outbuildings to be compatible with the main structure on the lot in material and design, using existing historic outbuildings in the districts as an example. Limit the size and scale of garages and accessory structures so that the integrity of the original structure, or the size of the existing lot, is not compromised or significantly diminished. New garages and accessory buildings should be located in rear yards and not past the centerline of the house.

In support

Paul Ingold, 3500 Turnbury Lane, previously sworn or affirmed.

Mr. Cowhig said the Neighborhood Board voted to support the application on the condition that the vinyl siding not be used. Staff had already dealt with that.

In opposition

None.

Summary

Chair Stout said this is Application No. 801 for 204 West Bessemer. The applicant is David Brossoit. A description of the work is construction of a carport. Staff recommends in favor of this application based off the Guidelines for Garages and Accessory Buildings, page 36, Nos. 1 through 3. Mr. Cowhig

mentioned that on the elevation drawings it indicates that there would be vinyl siding and that is not the case. They have indicated they will use the new materials list that is the *Design Guidelines* book.

Speaking in support of the application was Paul Ingold, who was speaking on behalf of the owners who were out of town. His address is 3500 Turnbury Lane. He mentioned that they were trying to pull details from the house using a hipped roof and other architectural details that would blend in. He also pointed to the example of the other carport that is also located a few doors away on Bessemer. There was concern by Ms. Freyaldenhoven that the frieze board might not have been substantial enough, but after discussion, she did not have an issue with that. Fisher Park Neighborhood Association indicated by e-mail to Mr. Cowhig that they are in support with the condition that there is no vinyl, which we have already established. There was no one else to speak in favor of and no one to speak in opposition to the application.

Discussion

Ms. Hatfield said she was very excited about this house working out altogether.

Finding of fact

Ms. Hatfield moved that based upon the facts presented in the Application No. 801 and the public hearing, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments 1 through 3 and the Guidelines relating to Garages and Accessory Structures, page 35-36, are acceptable as findings of fact. Ms. Hensley seconded the motion. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Stout, Coleman, Freyaldenhoven, Hatfield, Hensley, Wharton. Nays: None.)

Motion

Therefore, Ms. Hatfield moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approve Application No. 801 and grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to David Brossoit for work at 204 West Bessemer Avenue. Ms. Hensley seconded the motion. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Stout, Coleman, Freyaldenhoven, Hatfield, Hensley, Wharton. Nays: None.)

d) Location: 600 Fifth Avenue
Application No. 800
Applicant: John and Judy Worsley
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 8-9-06 (RECONSIDERATION DENIED)

Description of work (after-the-fact)

Note: This is a request for a reconsideration of a denied application for a Certificate of Appropriateness. The following is taken from the Rules of Procedure:

RECONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS THAT HAVE BEEN DENIED

The order of business for reconsideration of applications for Certificate of Appropriateness which previously have been denied shall be as follows:

The chairman shall entertain a motion from a member of the Commission that the applicant be allowed to present evidence in support of the request for reconsideration. Such evidence shall be

limited to that which is necessary to enable the Commission to determine whether or not there has been a substantial change in the facts, evidence or conditions relating to the application; provided, however, that the applicant shall be given the opportunity to present any other additional supporting evidence if the Commission decides to reconsider the application.

After receiving the evidence, the Commission shall proceed to deliberate whether or not there has been a substantial change in the facts, evidence or conditions relating to the application which would warrant reconsideration. If the Commission finds that there has been such a change, it shall thereupon treat the request as a new application received at that time.

Motion to consider reopening the application

Mr. Wharton moved that the Commission consider reopening the application for reconsideration simply because they denied it last time because they did not feel they had enough information and the applicant was not here. Since he is here now, he would like to hear what the applicant has to say. Ms. Freyaldenhoven seconded the motion. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Stout, Coleman, Freyaldenhoven, Hatfield, Hensley, Wharton. Nays: None.)

Mr. Cowhig said the applicant was allowed to submit evidence in support of the request for reconsideration.

In support

John Worsley, 513 Park Avenue, previously sworn or affirmed. He said this was a duplex rental unit. His wife had always handled the rental property and obviously she dropped the ball the first time, which is why he was here this time. They had done a bunch of work on the house and while they were working on it, it was empty and it was unfortunately empty for over a year, which meant they lost their grandfathering as a duplex. So the Zoning Inspector said that it had to revert back to single family and part of that was removing the second entrance, which went up to the second floor. His wife got the Zoning Notice and fought with the Zoning Inspector, saying that they had to do this, that it was a done deal and she went ahead and did it. He apologized for that. If it had been him, he would have applied for a certificate, but he was not involved in it at the time. When she got the Notice of Violation, she called and inquired about an application for a certificate. He did not know it at the time, but she really did not put any information on the application other than what was done and she perhaps thought that Mr. Cowhig would relay the information that she gave him and apparently that did not happen. So he was here to explain what was going on. The reason it was done is because it is being required by Zoning to take that door off in order to revert it back to single family. At this point, if the Commission rejects the application again, they are in an untenable position since they have one department telling them to do one thing and another department telling them not to. The door was added when the house was converted to a duplex. It was not an original door.

Ms. Freyaldenhoven said she was trying to reconstruct and asked if this was not originally a wrap-around porch?

Mr. Worsley said probably yes.

Ms. Freyaldenhoven said it was infilled at some point in time because someone noted that it would be real unusual for a home to have that much plain face wall to the left of the front door without a window or something, but it never existed in that way before, she guessed, because they enclosed the side porch and used it as a stairway up.

Ms. Hatfield said on this picture there was space. Why is there no space on the other picture?

Mr. Worsley said that was because the space seen from this angle was an offset. In order to get the stairs all the way down to floor level they had to bring a little offset out from the front next to the original door. The door has always been flush with the offset. If they had put it flat with the original wall, they would not have been able to get the stairs all the way to the floor level because the bottom step was right inside the door. As soon as you opened the door, there was the step within that far (demonstrating) from the door closing on it. The little wall to the left there is 90 degrees to the door. In other words, it is not flat wall.

Ms. Hatfield said it looked like it was extended closer to the remaining door. It certainly looks that way and that is the main problem and looks very odd.

Mr. Worsley said in the lower picture, the remaining entrance is centered between the two blue-gray painted corner boards. In this picture, the corner board on the left is flush with the door, which indicates that the bump out where the opening was removed has been widened after that other doorway was removed.

Ms. Freyaldenhoven said she thought what their concern is that he could have achieved what Zoning is asking them to do, but as it was, as you looked through the front porch columns it was uniform from the centerline of the door, the proportions were correct from the centerline of the door and the columns. But now the way it has been framed in, it has moved over the protruding wall so that you lose all the proportion as you are looking at that porch. So they were not saying that he should not have closed in the door per Zoning's requirement, but in doing so, when they additionally moved the wall over, it messed up the proportions of that front elevation and the approach to the front door.

Mr. Worsley said they had to bring the stairway down and bring it to a landing and then turn it into the foyer, which is why that little extra was added to be able to make the corner.

Mr. Wharton said the extending of that wall that the old doorway was on was to make room for the landing, to turn the corner back into the foyer. So there is a landing there where that door used to be right now.

Ms. Hatfield said not only in just moving the wall itself, but probably we would have required some sort of replacement with maybe some sort of traditional window that would be in a stairwell in that area because it is highly unusual to have something like that.

Mr. Wharton said the problem the Commission has right now though is basically the symmetry of the front entrance is ruined and if the application had been made, they could have given him good advice before you did it.

Mr. Cowhig said it says that the Commission is entertaining a motion from a member of the Commission that the applicant be allowed to present evidence in support of the request for reconsideration. It was his understanding that that was what just happened. The next step would be to vote to reconsider.

Counsel Williams said Mr. Cowhig was correct. The Commission has heard new evidence. The Commission heard evidence at the last meeting regarding the project and you denied the project. Here is a motion to reconsider your decision to deny the project.

Ms. Hatfield said she did not think they should reopen this at this point. She would certainly reconsider it at some other point if there were a new application that included addressing the issues that we are

thinking about, but nothing that she had heard thus far brings to a point of reconsidering what we had before us last time.

Ms. Freyaldenhoven said that if they reopen it, they consider it as a new COA. If it were a new COA, she would expect some design concepts for how to fix what is unacceptable about it now.

Counsel Williams said if you vote not to reconsider, the previous decision stands. A vote to reconsider basically says that there has been new evidence presented that would make them want to change your mind. It is up to the Commission to determine how the Commission collectively feels about this. If you wish to instruct staff or the applicant as to why you are not voting to reconsider your decision and if there is some help or information, some guidance, that you wish to give, you certainly can give him that in your discussion of why you are or are not going to reconsider.

Ms. Hatfield said that procedurally if they vote not to reconsider it at this time, they still leave open the applicant's option to put a new application in that might address some of the concerns that have come up today?

Counsel Williams said that was correct. So you are not shutting the person out, they could come in with a new application with new things that they wish to do.

Ms. Freyaldenhoven said that seemed appropriate to her so she agreed. A future application would have to be comprehensive for all the changes that were made.

Counsel Williams said if the person did work without a COA, the person is currently in violation of the ordinance. In order to not be in violation of the ordinance, the person would have to submit the proper application to do work on the property in accordance with the Guidelines. He said he thought the Chair could just ask if there were a motion for reconsideration. If you do not hear any, you go on. If you do hear one, you can vote. He suggested if they had any discussions regarding the matter, go ahead and discuss the matter now, if you so choose. Then decide whether you are or are not going to vote to reconsider.

Chair Stout said he would like to give Mr. Worsley information if we decide not to so that he could come back with an appropriate application.

Ms. Freyaldenhoven said her concern would be over the symmetry issue relative to the front door. She was not aware of all the other miscellaneous issues of other items that might have been worked on around the house.

Mr. Wharton said the changing of the nature of the entryway was a real concern. He could not imagine that they would have given permission ever to do that.

Ms. Freyaldenhoven said because that was once a wrap-around porch, she could only assume that there is another primary stair in this house. The stair that comes down and is turning now in front of door would not be the primary staircase. This was a secondary staircase to access the upstairs. She did not know unless they took out the original stair when they made it into a duplex.

Ms. Hatfield said there was no telling with these houses what was done. She also had serious concern about having a surface across the front that is such a large surface that has no break with a window. If there were going to be a stairwell there, then there would traditionally in these sorts of houses be some sort of smaller window in the stairwell. So that is the other concern that she would have and she thought

that both of these situations could be easily remedied by just submitting a plan that addresses the issues that we have expressed.

Chair Stout asked if there were a motion as to whether or not we consider this or not? Hearing none, the Commission would not be reconsidering this Application 800 for work at 600 Fifth Avenue for Judy and John F. Worsley for reconsideration of denied application to eliminate two front entrances. He encouraged the applicant to work with staff on a future application to correct these violations.

e) Location: 711 Fifth Avenue
Application No. 804
Applicant: Jacynthia Mitchell
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 8-16-06 (GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS)

Description of Work

Construction of addition to house.

Staff comment and recommendation: Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff's opinion the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Additions (pages 75-76)* for the following reasons:

Fact: The house is a two story Queen Anne/Colonial Revival located in the Charles B. Aycock Historic District.

Fact: The proposed addition is relatively small and will be located at rear of the structure. It will not alter the appearance of principal elevations.

Fact: The roofline of the addition is not in the same plane as the roofline of the main block of the house.

Fact: New windows will match the design of existing windows. Siding, trimwork, foundation masonry, roofing shingles, etc. will match the house.

Guideline 4

Limit the size and scale of additions so that the integrity of the original structure is not compromised.

Guideline 5

Changes in height that alter the character and scale of the existing building to accommodate an addition are not appropriate.

Guideline 2

Distinguish additions from the original structure through change in roofline, wall plane, detailing, and/or material.

Guideline 1

In terms of material, style, and detail, design additions to be compatible with the original structure rather than duplicating it exactly.

Proposed Conditions

That a site plan and materials list and samples be provided for staff approval prior to construction. Windows should be wood, double-hung windows, SDL (simulated divided light) with permanent muntins on interior and exterior of the glazing that matches the existing windows as closely as possible.

In support

Mr. Cowhig said the Neighborhood Board voted to support the application.

Jacynthia Mitchell, 711 Fifth Avenue, was sworn or affirmed.

In opposition

None.

Summary

Chair Stout said this is Application No. 804 for work at 711 Fifth Avenue. The applicant is Jacynthia Mitchell. A description of the work is construction of addition to house. Staff recommends in favor of this with conditions. They are basing this decision on Guidelines for New Additions, page 75-76, Guidelines 1,2,4 and 5. Staff comments were that they did not feel that this would affect the front elevation of the house. The application would use the windows, siding and trimwork that were compatible with or the same as the existing windows, siding, trim, foundation, roofing shingles, etc. The staff did recommend conditions. The conditions are that a site plan and materials list and samples be provided for staff approval prior to construction. They felt that windows should be wood, double-hung, simulated divided light with permanent muntins on interior and exterior of the glazing, but matches existing windows as closely as possible.

Discussion

Ms. Freyaldenhoven said she thought the conditions were the only initial concerns that she had, that all materials run through staff and there is a site plan submitted for your review as well.

Ms. Hatfield said she thought it looks like a good plan too. She thought this was great for the neighborhood.

Finding of fact

Ms. Hatfield moved that based upon the facts presented in Application No. 804 and the public hearing, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission find that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that staff comments 1 through 5 and Guidelines relating to Additions, page 75-76, are acceptable as findings of fact. Mr. Wharton seconded the motion. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Stout, Coleman, Freyaldenhoven, Hatfield, Hensley, Wharton. Nays: None.)

Motion

Therefore, Ms. Hatfield moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approve Application No. 804 and grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to Jacynthia Mitchell for work at 711 Fifth Avenue, with the following conditions: That the site plan and materials list and samples be provided for staff approval prior to construction and that the windows should be wood, double-hung windows, with the muntin pattern match that of the rest of the house and that the windows be either simulated divided light or true divided light with permanent muntins on the interior and exterior of the glazing that matches the existing windows as closely as possible. Ms. Freyaldenhoven seconded the motion. The Commission voted unanimously 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Stout, Coleman, Freyaldenhoven,

Hatfield, Hensley, Wharton. Nays: None.)

f) **Location: 711 Fifth Avenue**
Application No. 802
Applicant: Jacynthia Mitchell
Property Owner: Same
Date Application Received: 8-16-06 (GRANTED WITH CONDITION)

Description of Work

Landscaping including removal of two trees located in front of the house.

Staff comment and recommendation

Based on information contained in the application, the staff recommends in favor of granting this Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions. In the staff's opinion the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Design Guidelines—Trees and Landscaping (pages 21-23)* for the following reasons:

Fact: The house is a two story Queen Anne/Colonial Revival located in the Charles B. Aycock Historic District.

Fact: The proposed landscaping plan would result in the removal of two trees located in the front yard.

Fact: The trees proposed for removal block the view of the house from the street. One of the central purposes of the historic districts is to allow the public to enjoy the historic architecture in the districts.

Fact: These are not mature trees. They were started in the 1990s.

Fact: These Maple trees tend to have shallow root systems that deplete the moisture in the soil and making it difficult to maintain other plant materials. The result is often bare spots, which is not characteristic of lawns in the historic district.

Fact: Removal of these trees would allow other trees to flourish.

Fact: Shade trees that can be gradually limbed up to eventually provide tall canopies are recommended.

Guidelines:

1. *Retain mature trees that contribute to the character of the historic district.*
5. *Replace mature trees with similar canopy trees and in the same location when they are damaged or diseased. When same site location is not practical, select locations for replacement trees that would enhance the appearance and character of the historic streetscape.*
6. *Take all precautions to protect existing trees during new construction, paving and any site work. Refer to the Tree Protection Guide in the appendix of this document for specific precautions and requirements.*

Condition:

That at least one new shade tree be started to compensate for the loss of these trees.

Chair Stout said Ms. Hatfield needed to leave.

Ms. Freyaldenhoven moved that Ms. Hatfield be excused from the meeting at 5:22 p.m., seconded by Mr. Wharton. The Commission voted 5-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Stout, Coleman, Freyaldenhoven, Hensley, Wharton. Nays: None. Abstain: Hatfield.)

In support

Mr. Cowhig said the Neighborhood Board voted to support the application.

Jacynthia Mitchell, 711 Fifth Avenue, previously sworn or affirmed.

In opposition

None.

Summary

Chair Stout said this is Application No. 804 for work at 711 Fifth Avenue. The applicant is Jacynthia Mitchell. The description of work is removal of two trees as part of the landscape plan. City staff recommends in favor of this application with conditions. Staff did mention that the trees block the view of the house and part of the reason we have the Historic Preservation Commission is to preserve the features of the house so that they are available for the public to view. Mr. Cowhig also mentioned that the Charles B. Aycock Neighborhood Association had voted in favor of this application or supporting it. Mr. Cowhig mentioned Guidelines for Trees and Landscaping, page 21-23, Guidelines Nos. 1,5 and 6. The Commission heard from the applicant, Jacynthia Mitchell, and she mentioned that they had talked to New Garden Landscaping and that New Garden had recommended the removal of these Maples to assist in the growth of the historic Holly trees that are at each corner of the property.

Discussion

Ms. Freyaldenhoven said she was in favor of the removal of the trees and did not really see the need for stipulation to replace them because she thought they would affect the growth of the Hollies.

Mr. Wharton said he agreed and preserving those Hollies is more historically important than providing a canopy. If we were to require them to plant two more canopy trees, we would be in the same situation where the front of the house would be obscured for at least another generation. As it is, they have some substantial tree cover already. He did not think it was fair to force the burden of the whole canopy onto one homeowner, but rather we should encourage some of the other homeowners to start putting trees in appropriate spots.

Finding of fact

Mr. Wharton moved that based upon the facts presented in Application No. 802 and the public hearing, the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission finds that the proposed project is congruous with the *Historic District Program Manual and Design Guidelines* and that all staff comments and Guidelines are acceptable as findings of fact. Ms. Coleman seconded the motion. The Commission voted 4-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Coleman, Freyaldenhoven, Hensley, Wharton. Nays: Stout.)

Motion

Therefore, Mr. Wharton moved that the Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission approves Application No. 802 and grants a Certificate of Appropriateness to Jacynthia Mitchell for work at 711 Fifth Avenue with no condition. Ms. Coleman seconded the motion. The Commission voted 4-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Coleman, Freyaldenhoven, Hensley, Wharton. Nays: Stout.)

ITEMS FROM THE COMMISSION CHAIRMAN

ELECTION OF VICE CHAIRMAN

Chair Stout said the Commission needed to elect a Vice Chairman. He said he would like to nominate David Wharton. Ms. Coleman seconded the nomination.

There were no other nominations.

The Commission voted 4-0-1 in favor of the nomination. (Ayes: Stout, Coleman, Freyaldenhoven, Hensley. Nays: None. Abstain: Wharton)

ITEMS FROM DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

a) 112 East Hendrix Street - progress report on work to meet Ordinance to Prevent Demolition by Neglect.

Ms. Geary said unless the two remaining persons in the audience did not mind, they really did not need to share the Commission comments.

The two persons in the audience left.

Ms. Geary said the Commissioners had in front of them what was given to them at the March, 2005 Historic Preservation Commission meeting and this was the report that was done on 112 East Hendrix Street to determine that it had fallen under the Ordinance to Prevent Demolition by Neglect. She had planned to talk a little about the ordinance. However, their two newest members, Donna and Rhonda Ayscue, were not here and she thought the others had already had experience with the Ordinance to Prevent Demolition by Neglect.

Russ Clegg, who is in their office now and at the time was the Neighborhood Association president, did the initial report with her, went out with her about a month and a half ago to just go over the items that had been cited. One thing she did want to remind the Commission is that the purpose of the Ordinance to Prevent Demolition by Neglect is not to renovate a house, it is to fix those items that have been identified as deteriorating. They really felt like, in terms of what had been noted in this original report, they have met that intent. If you will remember, much of what started all of this is actually image No. 6 in the handout that shows the side porch that was torn off and they have actually repaired that and done an impeccable job. If you have not been by, she suggested highly that they drive by and take a look. Additionally the retaining walls, images Nos. 9 and 7 show a retaining wall, and they have completely rebuilt the retaining walls and they went to a pretty great level to match the brick as best they could and, in fact, the contractor called us the day that the brick was delivered and said, "Can you come out here because I think it might be a little bit more orange than what the sample was that we saw." Staff went out there, they were like, "No, this is wonderful. This is as close as it is probably going to get."

There are still some things with the house that, if we were going after a true restoration renovation, still need attention. The windows need glazing. One thing that they did notice is that the back porch (she had no images) area, the paint is flaking off of it, but we did not cite that as one of the Ordinance to Prevent Demolition by Neglect citations so they did not feel that was something for which they could hold them accountable under this particular petition because it was not said by the neighborhood and they, as staff, saw so many other things about the like, such as the roof and the water issues that really

needed addressing first that they just did not even go to the fact that this back porch area that has vertical bead board planks have peeling paint. There are some issues with the east retaining wall, but at the time they did the report, this east retaining wall was not as tilted or causing as much jeopardy on the property as the other retaining walls. So she felt like, as far as they were concerned (she really did not know what the protocol here is) and as far as the staff site visit, they feel like they have met the intent of the petition and the citation and feel like they could, if the Commission agrees, vote to make this a closed case. This is the first time they have actually a petition that has gone through the entire process and the applicant has actually done the work and come back.

Mr. Wharton asked if the drip edge on the roof was addressed, since it had come up in the past and had damaged to the soffits and fascia board?

Ms. Geary that she and Mr. Clegg talked about they did their second site visit was that the house does not have a gutter system in place, but they were thinking that originally it would not have had a gutter system, so she was not sure of the drip edge (she thought she understood what he was talking about), the edge that goes under the shingles to keep the water from running down at the edge of the top of the soffit. The roof has been repaired perfectly so she would assume that that has been addressed.

Mr. Wharton said it did not appear to be.

Ms. Geary said if that was something that needs to still be completed and they just did not catch that, then you could say, contact these people and tell them there is one more step that needs to be taken, that they did not complete the roof to the extent that it needed to be.

Mr. Cowhig said they could ask one of the Inspectors to check that.

Ms. Geary said they could do that or they could probably just call the contractor that they had been working with and saying, "Look, we brought this to the Commission to get them to sign off on it and they brought this up as an issue."

Mr. Wharton said he was the person who brought this issue up and one of the reasons that he did was because there is another house with a similar roof form that is owned by the same property owner and was roofed and it was reroofed in the same way. It is on Friendly Avenue. Even after the reroofing, because the shingles do overhang the fascia, but within a year of the roof being replaced, water is already damaging the fascia and soffits on that building. Drip edge is not expensive. Adding that one element would probably save the property owner thousands of dollars.

Ms. Geary said in terms of moving this forward and not having to bringing this back again for a third month, they could make a motion saying that you approve or accept the work that has been done, with the exception of this drip edge that needs to be applied. Staff could send a letter like that, make a phone call and really get them to finish that, but the official signing off on it does not occur until the drip edge is added.

Ms. Coleman asked if they had documentation as to exactly what had been done and if it is a new roof or if it is a patched roof?

Ms. Geary said staff monitored this and went out probably every couple of weeks.

Chair Stout said he did not want them to think the Commission was nit-picking the job. He had been by there many times and was really impressed with what they have accomplished there. He would hate to

see those accomplishments ruined within a short time by leaving out one little detail.

Ms. Geary said staff's letter to them could say how pleased the Commission was with the work that had been done, but suggested this small additional drip edge be done. We could say how significant this is because of the long-term likely of the repairs you have already made to the house. She thought that was a very customer-friendly way of approaching it.

Ms. Freyaldenhoven felt that the house probably originally had a gutter system.

Ms. Geary said staff could address the gutters and drip edge. She said staff was sure that there had originally been gutters on the house since there were no gutters there when they started.

Mr. Cowhig said in the letter he thought they should recommend that the drip edge be added and the gutters be added.

Ms. Geary said both of these items were for the longevity of the money and the investment that they have put into this. To her, pointing that out is to their benefit. The front and side porches have been rebuilt.

Mr. Wharton said he would be in favor of closing this with the exception that at a minimum, they put a drip edge on the roof and recommend guttering the house.

Ms. Geary directed the Commissioners to image 1, which was what was there in terms of a gutter system where there are no gutters. There were holes in the soffit as well.

Counsel Williams said he had never done one of these either. The question is, did they just bring it up and then he acquiesced to do this. If he remembered correctly, they did not go through the formal Prevention of Demolition by Neglect because he agreed to do it.

Ms. Geary said they could still send a letter, but would have to change the phrasing of it somewhat to fit the facts.

Counsel Williams suggested, "Thank you for living up to what you agreed to do and you have completed the work, which would not have this under the affect of this Ordinance. However, there is one thing that must be completed to help you in the future and help the property not get into the same conditions, which is we would require that you put a drip edge on the roof and recommend that you would put up gutters to keep in good condition all the work that you have done on this property."

Counsel Williams said he would look in the ordinance, but he did not think there was any action that you need to take, except if they did not do what they were supposed to do, you would take it to the next step, which is one of the City Departments, he believed.

Mr. Cowhig said it would be a petition to the Engineering and Inspections Department.

Ms. Freyaldenhoven said he did built back the porches, but she believed if they would look at four squares throughout the neighborhood, they would see the guttering system as part of the whole roof system.

The question was also asked, "Where would the balustrade at the top fall under that around the porch?" Would that be because it was not there when they identified it?

Counsel Williams said at the time it came into the historic district, what was the condition of the house at that point? Were there gutters there, were there balustrades there? Unless you have a picture to prove and then when did they go?

Chair Stout said he guessed no action was needed then.

b) Update on Commission Training

Mr. Cowhig said staff wanted to talk to the Commission about upcoming training opportunities. On September 8, staff is sponsoring a lunchtime training session for Commissioners and what they wanted to do at that meeting was to have sort of a refresher course on a whole range of Commission activities and obligations, responsibilities, discussions of how the Commission is set up under City Ordinances and their Director, Andy Scott, would attend that meeting. But it really would be just a refresher course on the basics of serving on the Historic Preservation Commission. Staff would like to provide quarterly lunchtime training sessions. They had done this in the past and it was rather successful and they would like to do that again. So let staff know as quickly as possible if you will be able to attend on the 8th at noon. They will have it in the Plaza Level Conference Room and will provide a bag lunch of some type. If you have any dietary restrictions, let staff know that too.

Mr. Cowhig said there were a couple of other opportunities for training. The Preservation North Carolina conference is coming up on October 5 through 7 in Wilmington and it is billed as "Preservation and Wellness," and it really does have pretty interesting conference sessions. They will talk on everything from healthy homes. It has the Commission Assistance Mentoring Program Camp on Thursday; so if you are interested in that please let staff know as soon as possible. If you want to register for the camp that is on Thursday, if there is enough interest they could go down for that possibly. He had a couple of the publications if anyone would like them.

He said the third thing is that there is a seminar sponsored by the National Preservation Institute tentative set for Greensboro on November 15-16 and the overview of the seminar is the Secretary of Interior Standards for the treatment of historic properties from the basis for historic rehabilitation for Federal tax benefits, but it is really a pretty comprehensive program of preservation information and really excellent trainers. It is expensive, \$375 for the session, but if there were any interest in that, he would be glad to send this to you by e-mail and if you are interested, let us know. Maybe the City will pick up some of the tab, he did not know, but they could certainly ask.

SPEAKERS FROM THE AUDIENCE

None.

Mr. Cowhig said he would like to introduce Mary Ruffin Hambury, who is the new Certified Local Government Coordinator and the Preservation Commission, but she spent the day with them and they toured their historic districts. She is trying to get to know the local Commissions. She is the person at the State if you have questions or needs about Commission work.

Mr. Cowhig said they also had Julie Curry, who works from the County and is the staff person for the Guilford County Historic Preservation Commission. They are trying to do a lot more coordinated work between the City and the County. As a matter of fact, they will be undertaking the new survey update in the fall and they hope to include to entire City and areas of the County where development is occurring very rapidly.

ADJOURN

Since there was no further business before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 6:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cowhig, Executive Secretary
Greensboro Historic Preservation Commission

MC/jd.ps